



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,715	10/27/2003	Jussi Maaniitty	944-001.120	5201
4955 7590 04/18/2008 WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468				
EXAMINER				
PITARO, RYAN F				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2174				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/694,715

Applicant(s)

MAANIITY ET AL.

Examiner

RYAN F. PITARO

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/11/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-15 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. This action is in response to the Amendment filed 2/11/2008. This action is Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,4,5,8-11,14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deutscher et al ("Deutscher", US 2003/0174160) in view of Banerjee ("Banerjee", US 2004/0130566) in view of Obrador ("Obrador", US 7,149,755).

As per claim 1, Deutscher teaches a method comprising: assembling a plurality of objects of a slide that are to be displayed successively one after the other when a multimedia presentation is played on a communication or computing terminal having a display device (Figure 8, [0062]-[0065]); and displaying at the same time the first and second column side-by-side on the display device in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed when the presentation is played (Figure 8, [0062]-[0065]). Deutscher fails to distinctly point out slides displayed in parallel for editing. However, Banerjee teaches displaying objects of a slide in parallel for editing by a user (Figure 4, [0017]-[0020]). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Banerjee with the method of Deutscher. Motivation to do so would have been to interact and dynamically update the content of the presentation in a unique way. Deutscher-Banerjee fail to particularly point out the objects of the slide being side by side. However Obrador teaches also assembling in a first and second column any and all objects of the slide that are to be displayed in parallel with and side-by-side with any of the objects of the first column when the presentation is played (Figure 10a-10c, temporally ordered data structures). Therefore it would have been obvious to and artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Obrador with the method of Deutscher-Banerjee. Motivation to do so would have been to display temporally order structures in a context sensitive way to the playback of the selected media, in a way that new or forgotten associations may be discovered while browsing through the collection of media objects as a result of the side by side associations.

Claims 4,5,8,11 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 9, Deutscher-Banerjee-Obrador teaches a method wherein the second column includes only one object , which is to be displayed continuously when the presentation is played (Banerjee, Figure 4).

Claim 10 is similar in scope to that of claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 14, Deutscher-Banerjee-Obrador teaches a telecommunications network including a plurality of terminals according to claim 11 (Deutscher, [0052]).

Claim 15 is similar in scope to that of claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale

5. Claims 2,3,6-7,12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deutscher et al ("Deutscher", US 2003/0174160) and Banerjee ("Banerjee", US

2004/0130566) in view of Obrador ("Obrador", US 7,149,755) in view of Reams ("Reams", US 006/0168619).

As per claim 2, Deutscher-Banerjee-Obrador teaches objects in the first column (Deutscher, Figure 8) for editing are the objects included in a sequential time container within a parallel time container of a code fragment (Banerjee, Figure 4, [0017]-[0020]). Deutscher-Banerjee-Obrador fails to distinctly point out the presentation being an MMS message. However, Reams teaches the multimedia presentation is for communication as an MMS message ([0022]-[0023]. Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Reams with the method of Deutscher-Banerjee-Obrador. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a way to present the slide show to a vast array of users including those with small devices such as cell phones.

As per claim 3, Deutscher-Banerjee-Obrador -Reams teaches a method wherein SMIL is used with the editor to prescribe how the multimedia presentation is to be played (Reams, [0022]).

Claim 6 is similar in scope to that of claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 7 is similar in scope to that of claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 12 is similar in scope to that of claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is similar in scope to that of claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RYAN F. PITARO whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2174

(571)272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. F. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2174

/David A Wiley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174

